

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,308	COOKSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Danielsen	2627	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nathan Danielsen.

(3) Tiberiu Weisz.

(2) Dwayne Bost.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 July 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ishibashi (see PTO-892).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


DWAYNE BOST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicability of the Ishibashi reference with respect to applicant's claimed standard data was discussed. It was pointed out by the examiner that the synchronization signals of Ishibashi are interpreted to be included in applicant's claimed "standard data" because applicant has defined in the specification where data "standard data" is data recorded on a CD or DVD in a standard CD or DVD format, which includes synchronization marks. It was further pointed out by the examiner that synchronization marks are considered to be data as they are used in the prior art to indicate frame address data inside of sectors. Applicant's representative responded by indicating that the intended definition of the claimed term "standard data" was to exclude synchronization marks and include only user data or content data. Applicant's representative was then cautioned to ensure that there is adequate written description for this definition prior to amending the claims to include this limitation. Further, the rejections under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as found in the final action mailed 04 April 2007, were discussed in order to aid applicant's representative in overcoming them in response to this action.